REMARKS

Claims 1 to 4, 6 to 12, 14, and 16 to 20 are in the application, of which claims 1, 12

and 17 are independent. Favorable reconsideration and further examination are

respectfully requested.

The Office Action states the following:

> 1. Examiner notes that a title of amendment filed on 04/04/08 such as "Amendment
>   after final" and "Amendment in reply to final action of October 5, 2007" are
>   incorrect. Examiner only sent out the "Non-final rejection" in October 5, 2007.
>   Appropriate correction is required.

Since this comment refers to the prior response, we are not sure what correction would be

required, other than to agree that the prior paper was mislabeled.

The Office Action states the following:

> **Claim Objections**
>
> 2. Claim 17 is objected to because of the following informalities: the claim claims "a
>   machine-readable medium that stores instructions...", it shows the medium
>   actually do not store instructions. The claim should be taken off the word "that".
>   Appropriate correction is required.

We disagree with this statement. Contrary to the foregoing statement, the word "that"

actually does mean that the medium stores the instructions. However, in the interest of

advancing prosecution, we have removed "that" from claim 17.

The independent claims were rejected as follows:

3. Claims 1-3, 6, 10-12, 14, and 16-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Li et al. (Li) (5,699,523), and further in view of Hovell et al. (Hovell) (US 7,116,681 B1).

As shown above, the independent claims have been amended to recite that the command received from the client application is a hypertext transfer protocol (HTTP) command to retrieve data from the at least one device, and the command received from the server application is an HTTP command to retrieve data from the at least one device. Using an HTTP command is advantageous because it allows external data to be retrieved from a device behind a firewall and to pass through the firewall.

The applied art is not understood to disclose or to suggest the foregoing features. In this regard, referring to Fig. 1, Li describes a host computer 3 and a PC 2. Host computer 3 includes a router 360, servers 35 and 38, and clients 39 and 361. The Office Action refers to client 39, router 360 and server 38.[1] All of these applications are running on the same host computer[2]; accordingly, Li does not disclose or suggest a client application behind a first firewall and a server application behind a second firewall.

Furthermore, Li describes two types of message transfers: synchronous and asynchronous.[3] In an example of synchronous communications, referring to Fig. 2, a client 39 sends a message to router 360. Router 360 then routes that message to queue 381 of server 38. The converse occurs when server 38 sends a message to client 39.[4]

---

[1] See, e.g., page 3 of the Office Action
[2] See, e.g., Fig. 1 and col. 3, lines 32 to 64
[3] Col. 3, line 65 to col. 4, line 3
[4] Col. 4, lines 35 to 57

In an example of asynchronous communications, referring to Fig. 3C, client 39 sends a message to router 360 with an identifier of "X" to read a message from the server of message box 35. Router 360 sends the message to queue 351 of message box server 35. Message box server 35 responds to router 360. Router 360 receives the message, processes the message and forwards the result to client 39.[5]

In both the asynchronous communication and the synchronous communication, the router sends information directly to the client. Therefore, even if the applications of Figs. 2 and 3A to 3C were not part of the same host computer (which they are), there would be no reason to assume that those applications would be behind firewalls. More specifically, if the client and server applications were on separate machines behind firewalls, the routers would not be able to send communications directly to them, as is done in Li.

Furthermore, given the configuration of Li, there would be no reason to use HTTP commands. That is, in Li, there is no reason that the command received from the client application would be a hypertext transfer protocol (HTTP) command to retrieve data, and that the command received from the server application would be an HTTP command to retrieve data. That is, (1) there is no reason to use HTTP commands *within a computer system*, and (2) there is no reason to use HTTP commands in situations where the router is able to directly communicate its message to a requesting application (client or server).

In this regard, page 11 of the Office Action indicates that it would have been obvious to use HTTP in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,792,337 (Blackett). However, Blackett

---

[5] Col. 5, lines 18 to 27. We note that line 27 indicates that the message is sent to the queue "client (38)". However, that appears to be an error given the context of the paragraph and that step 11.2 of Fig. 3C appears to be sending the processed message to client (39).

merely describes use of the HTTP communication protocol between master and slave devices, and for communication through firewalls. However, there would be no motivation to combine Blackett with Li in the manner suggested in the Office Action because (1) all of Li's applications reside on a single host computer and not behind firewalls, and (2) it is necessary for Li's router to directly communicate with the client and server in order to perform its message transfer function in the manner described. Accordingly, we submit that it would not have been obvious to use HTTP in Li's system.

Hovell was cited for its alleged disclosure of an intermediary protocol, and is not understood to remedy the foregoing deficiencies of Li and Blackett vis-à-vis the independent claims.

For at least the foregoing reasons, we submit that the independent claims are patentable over the applied art.

Dependent claims are also believed to define patentable features. Each dependent claim partakes of the novelty of its corresponding independent claim and, as such, has not been discussed specifically herein.

It is believed that all of the pending claims have been addressed. However, the absence of a reply to a specific rejection, issue or comment does not signify agreement with or concession of that rejection, issue or comment. In addition, because the arguments made above may not be exhaustive, there may be reasons for patentability of any or all pending claims (or other claims) that have not been expressed. Finally, nothing in this paper should be construed as an intent to concede any issue with regard to any claim,

except as specifically stated in this paper, and the amendment of any claim does not necessarily signify concession of unpatentability of the claim prior to its amendment.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, the entire application is believed to be in condition for allowance, and such action is respectfully requested at the Examiner's earliest convenience.

Applicant's attorney can be reached at the address shown below. Telephone calls regarding this application should be directed to 617-521-7896.

Please apply any deficiencies or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account 06-1050, referencing 11333-026001.

Respectfully submitted,

January 30, 2009

Date:_____

/Paul Pysher/

_____

Paul A. Pysher
Reg. No. 40,780

Fish & Richardson P.C.
225 Franklin Street
Boston, MA 02110-2804
Telephone: (617) 542-5070
Facsimile: (617) 542-8906

22103496.doc